


PACIFIC RAILROADS AS CONTEMPLATED BY THE
ACT OF JULY 1, 1862.




PACIFIC RAILROADS AS CONSTRUCTED.



BOND-AIDED LINE.

Central Pacific: Ogden-Sacramento.
Western Pacific: Sacramento-San Jose.
(W. P. absorbed by C. P. 1870.)




CENTRAL PACIFIC NON-BOND-AIDED EXTENSIONS.

(Shown in hatched lines.)



APPROXIMATE ROUTE OF SOUTHERN PA-
CIFIC LINE CONTEMPLATED IN ARTICLES
OF ASSOCIATION, DECEMBER 2, 1865.



CENTRAL PACIFIC-SOUTHERN PACIFIC ARTERIAL SYSTEM.

(Constructed under 12 Stat. 489, 14 Stat. 239,
14 Stat. 292, 16 Stat. 573.)

— Central Pacific.
— Southern Pacific.



PHOTOGRAPHIC RELIEF MAP OF CALIFORNIA.

INDEX OF MAPS

	Page
Pacific Railroads as Contemplated by the Act of July 1, 1862	14
Pacific Railroads as Constructed.....	17
Central Pacific Bond-aided Line.....	22
Central Pacific Non-bond-aided Extensions.....	30
Approximate Route of Southern Pacific Line Contemplated in Articles of Association, December 2, 1865.....	33
Central Pacific-Southern Pacific Arterial System, showing the Four Lines to the Boundaries of California Authorized by Congress	43
Northern Division of Southern Pacific.....	68
Rail Connection Between Tehama and Portland.....	214
Routes Between Sacramento and San Francisco.....	215
Eastern Rail Connections of the Southern Pacific.....	233
Union Pacific Lines to the Pacific Coast, and Their Relation Geographically to the Central Pacific Main Line.....	267
Union Pacific Lines to the Pacific Coast, and Their Relation Geographically to the Central Pacific Main Line, Feeders and Extensions.....	267
San Joaquin Valley Lines.....	274
Southern Pacific Coast Line from San Francisco to Los Angeles, Opened 1901.....	276

INDEX.

Statement of the Case.

	Page
Outline of Case.....	1
(1) Events from the cession of upper California to the United States by Mexico under the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, February 2, 1848, to the incorporation of the Central Pacific Railroad Company under the laws of California, June 28, 1861, followed by the Act of July 1, 1862 (12 Stat. 489).....	9
(2) The Act of July 1, 1862 (12 Stat. 489), and the construction of the bond-aided lines from the Missouri River to the Pacific Ocean, including (a) the construction between Ogden and Sacramento by the Central Pacific, and (b) the construction between Sacramento and San Jose by the Western Pacific, which latter company was absorbed by the Central Pacific in consolidation proceedings June 23, 1870.....	12
(3) The construction of the Central Pacific non-bond-aided lines in California.....	26
(a) Roseville to the Oregon boundary.....	27
(b) Niles to Oakland.....	28
(c) Lathrop to Goshen.....	29
(4) The history of the Southern Pacific Railroad Company from its incorporation in 1865 including its acceptance on November 30, 1866, of the grant made to it by the Atlantic and Pacific Act of July 27, 1866, and its acceptance on April 3, 1871, of the grant made to it by the Texas Pacific Act of March 3, 1871, and thenceforward until its road reached Yuma, October 22, 1877.....	32
(5) The history of the Southern Pacific Sunset-Gulf line from the completion of the road to Yuma, October 22, 1877, under the Texas Pacific Act, to the opening of the line to New Orleans February 1, 1883.....	52
(6) The operation of all the Southern Pacific lines by the Central Pacific, commencing with the construction south of Goshen in 1872 and ending April 1, 1885...	55
(7) The leasing of the Southern Pacific lines to the Central Pacific Railroad Company.....	67

INDEX

iii

	Page
(8) Identity of management and equipment in the construction and operation of the Central Pacific-Southern Pacific system and its control by Stanford, Huntington, Hopkins and Crocker.....	74
(9) Steps taken between March 17, 1884, and April 1, 1885, for the organization of the Southern Pacific Company, for the termination of the leases to the Central Pacific Railroad Company, and for the leasing of the Central Pacific and Southern Pacific Lines to the Southern Pacific Company.....	102
(10) The change from Central Pacific operation to Southern Pacific operation March 1, 1885, to April 1, 1885....	110
(11) The operation of the lines and the intercorporate relations of the corporations comprising the Southern Pacific-Central Pacific system from April 1, 1885, to the filing of the petition herein February 11, 1914...	121
(12) Governmental action—Congressional and executive—between April 1, 1885, and the passage of the Act of July 7, 1898 (30 Stat. 652, 659), creating the commission for the settlement of the Central Pacific debt....	124
(13) The Act of July 7, 1898 (30 Stat. 652, 659), and the preliminary negotiations which led to the settlement of February 1, 1899 (executed February 16, 1899), together with plans for the readjustment of the Central Pacific Railroad Company, all of which immediately became matter of general and public knowledge	149
(14) The settlement with the Government, dated February 1, 1899, but actually executed February 16, 1899.....	154
(15) The part which the Southern Pacific was obliged to and did take in the readjustment of the Central Pacific Railroad Company's affairs, including the subordination of its 99-years' lease, without which the reorganization could not have been accomplished.....	166
(16) The approval by Congress of the settlement of February 1, 1899, by the passage of the Act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1245), conferring authority upon the Secretary of the Treasury to carry the settlement into effect	176

	Page
(17) The payment of \$11,798,314.14 to the Government by Speyer & Company March 27, 1899, as a part of the Central Pacific settlement.....	181
(18) The incorporation of the Central Pacific Railway Company in August, 1899, the transfer to that company of the assets of the old company, the issuance of the securities of the new company, the purchase from the new company of its preferred stock by the Southern Pacific Company, and the purchase by the Southern Pacific Company of the stock of the old company from the holders thereof.....	182
(19) The Act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1023) as a further recognition and confirmation of the readjustment plan.....	185
(20) The payment to the Government of the \$47,050,172.48, with interest, in discharge of the sixteen notes remaining in the hands of the Government after Speyer & Company had taken over on March 10, 1899, the four earliest maturing notes.....	189
(21) The death on August 13, 1900, of C. P. Huntington, the last survivor of the four men who built the Southern Pacific-Central Pacific system; the acquisition by the Union Pacific of the Huntington stock and other stock in the Southern Pacific Company, giving the Union Pacific a dominating control of the Southern Pacific-Central Pacific system; and the operations of the latter by the former until the final decree in the Union Pacific unmerger suit, June 30, 1913...	190
(22) The case of United States v. Union Pacific Railroad Company, 226 U. S. 61, from its commencement February 1, 1908, to the entry of the final decree June 30, 1913.....	192
(23) How the question of the purchase of the Central Pacific by the Union Pacific arose and came to be spoken of in the Union Pacific case.....	200
(24) How the plan for the purchase of the Central Pacific by the Union Pacific from the Southern Pacific failed of accomplishment.....	206
(25) The competitive conditions existing between the Ogden Route and the Southern Pacific Sunset-Gulf Route before the Union Pacific Merger of 1901.....	219

INDEX

v

	Page
(26) The non-competitive conditions between the Ogden Route and the Southern Pacific Sunset-Gulf Route during the Union Pacific merger from 1901 to 1913.....	220
(27) The return to the conditions which existed prior to the merger of 1901, and the resumption of competition between the Ogden Route and the Southern Pacific Sunset-Gulf Route consequent upon the unmerger..	220
(28) The treatment of the Union Pacific by the Central Pacific both before and since the Union Pacific merger.....	222
(29) The treatment accorded by the Southern Pacific to its connections generally.....	229
(30) The fair treatment accorded the Central Pacific by Stanford, Huntington, Hopkins and Crocker, notwithstanding their interest in the Southern Pacific Sunset-Gulf Route; and the continuation of that treatment down to the time of the commencement of this suit.....	234
(31) The radical changes in traffic conditions generally between 1901, when the Union Pacific merger occurred, and 1914, when this suit was commenced.....	241
(a) Through routing and joint rates under the Hepburn Act of June 29, 1906 (34 Stat. 584).....	241
(b) The right of the shipper to route his own freight under Act of June 18, 1910 (36 Stat. 551)....	242
(c) The Panama Canal opened August 15, 1914.....	243
(d) The San Pedro, Los Angeles & Salt Lake Railroad Company operating since 1905.....	244
(e) Western Pacific Railway Company operating since July 20, 1910.....	245
(f) Electric lines in California constructed since 1901	245
(32) The Southern construction (Yuma-El Paso-New Orleans) as a normal and natural growth.....	250
(33) The absence of attempts at monopoly and monopolistic practices	252
(34) The active and vigorous competition between the Ogden and Sunset-Gulf Routes, and the absence of any attempt at monopoly, as shown by the report and order of the Interstate Commerce Commission granting the application of the Southern Pacific Company, under the Panama Canal Act Amendment of the Interstate Commerce Act, for permission to continue to operate the line of steamships which forms a part of the Sunset-Gulf route.....	253

	Page
(35) The impossibility of dismemberment of the Southern Pacific-Central Pacific system without substantial deterioration in the public service.....	259
<hr/>	
(36) Mileage of lines owned by Southern Pacific and proprietary companies, and detailed table of mileage of Central Pacific lines.....	268
(a) Mileage of lines owned by Southern Pacific and proprietary companies (June 30, 1915).....	268
<hr/>	
(37) Several subsidiary matters may be here noted to facilitate an understanding of the case.....	270
(a) United States v. Southern Pacific Company, United States Circuit Court, Southern District of California, commenced July 16, 1894, dismissed August 4, 1894.....	270
(b) A brief reference to the history of the more important corporations which figure in the case..	271
(c) The construction by the Southern Pacific Company of the line through the west side of the San Joaquin Valley.....	273
(d) The construction by the Southern Pacific Company of the Coast Line from San Francisco to Los Angeles.....	275
(e) The gradual decline in the importance of the Sunset-Gulf route since 1897.....	277
(f) Fires which prevented the production by the defendants of several records in the case.....	279
(g) The witnesses for the Government.....	279
<hr/>	
(38) Conclusion	281

ARGUMENT

	Page
I. This case does not involve any combination of competitive units, or any combination at all, for the Southern Pacific and Central Pacific lines were projected and built and have been operated since their origin as one property.....	282
II. At the time of the passage of the Anti-trust Act (July 2, 1890) the Southern Pacific and Central Pacific lines were owned by a single proprietor, although the Central Pacific lines were held under a 99-year lease made February 17, 1885, instead of in fee; but "it is obvious that in principle the right of a lessee is the same as that of a purchaser in fee." (224 U. S. 565).....	288
III. The Act of July 7, 1898 (30 Stat. 652, 659) creating the commission for the settlement of the Central Pacific debt, contemplated as natural if not inevitable, the agreement subsequently made, and it invested the commission with full authority to agree to the plan which was adopted for the payment of the indebtedness, including the provision by which the Southern Pacific Company acquired the stock of the Central Pacific Company.....	294
IV. In any event the Government is estopped by its conduct to question the legality of the unified control of the Central Pacific and the Southern Pacific lines	302
V. The present status of the Southern Pacific-Central Pacific lines was confirmed by the Acts of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1245), and March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1023).....	312
VI. It is established by the opinion and decree in United States v. Union Pacific Railroad Company, 226 U. S. 61 (1912), that up to the time of the Union Pacific merger in 1901, "sharp, well-defined and vigorous" competition existed between the Ogden and El Paso routes, notwithstanding the ownership of the Central Pacific by the Southern Pacific; and it is here in proof that the competitive conditions of 1901 and before were restored after the unmerger in 1913.....	318

- VII. It is thus apparent that we may draw upon the three departments of the Government of the United States for support in our position that the Southern Pacific may and does lawfully control and operate the Central Pacific and that no violation of the Anti-trust Act is involved in such control and operation..... 320
-
- VIII. Irrespective of the considerations already dealt with, and considering the matter as an open question, traffic conditions between the El Paso and Ogden routes are such that the control of the Central Pacific line by the Southern Pacific Company, does not constitute an undue restraint of commerce 323
-
- IX. The Government, by reason of the position taken and claims urged by it in the Union Pacific case, is estopped from questioning the validity of the ownership and control of the Central Pacific Railway Company by the Southern Pacific Company 337
-
- X. The final decree in the case of the United States v. Union Pacific Railroad Company, Southern Pacific Company, and others, is a bar to all relief sought by the Government in this case..... 349
-
- XI. No violation of the Pacific Railroad Laws is presented in this case..... 362
-
- XII. The construction which the Government attempts to put upon the Pacific Railroad Laws is inconsistent with the position which has always been taken by the three departments of the Government concerning the control of the Central Pacific by the Southern Pacific..... 372
-
- XIII. Even though a violation of the Pacific Railroad Laws were proved in the case, the remedy would not be dismemberment, but would be injunction of restraint or of command to comply with the provisions of the acts.....373
-
- XIV. There is no evidence whatever of any attempts at monopoly or monopolistic practices..... 374

XV. It is impossible to dismember the Southern Pacific-Central Pacific system without substantial deterioration in the public service..... 375

XVI. It is not necessary here to consider whether properties which had been operated together as one from their origin continuously down to July 2, 1890, under say, tenures at will, could or could not thereafter be legally unified by purchase, lease, etc., because at the time of the passage of the Anti-trust Act, as we have elsewhere shown, the properties here involved were owned by a single proprietor, although the tenure under which a part of the properties was owned was a 99-year term and not a fee..... 381

XVII. Considering that (a) these lines were operated as one from their origin, and that (b) on July 2, 1890, the Central Pacific lines were held under a 99-year term expiring April 1, 1984, it is clear that the lease of December 7, 1893, which cut down the term three months, viz: to January 1, 1984, is entirely lawful, leaving out of view the argument next to be made that, even if the lease were unlawful, the lessee, Southern Pacific Company, would be deemed to hold under the original term created February 17, 1885..... 383

XVIII. If the lease of December 7, 1893, were invalid as one executed after the passage of the Anti-trust Act, the Southern Pacific Company would nevertheless be treated at law and in equity as the holder of the 99-year term which it acquired under the lease of February 17, 1885 notwithstanding the provision of cancellation contained in the lease of December 7, 1893..... 384

XIX. We here argue but only briefly the point that the Anti-trust Act did not make unlawful the operation by a single proprietor of lines owned by him at the date of the passage of the act which were not then competitive but which could be made competitive if divorced..... 391

XX. The argument of counsel for the Government in this case overlooks the value and importance to the Government of the guaranty of the bonds by the Southern Pacific Company in 1899..... 394

	Page
XXI. Both sides seem to be agreed, although for different reasons, that the Government cannot be said to have been an accomplice in the violation of its own laws: the appellees contending that no laws were violated, and counsel for the Government asserting either that (a) the Government did not know the facts; or (b) was unconscious of the law; or (c) in final analysis had no power through its own officers to violate its own laws..	397
XXII. The argument of counsel that the 99-year lease of the Central Pacific lines to the Southern Pacific Company, dated February 17, 1885, was or is invalid, is without merit.....	402
XXIII. This case does not come within any rule or supposed rule dealing with the prevention of competition coming into existence.....	413
XXIV. The purely theoretical nature of the present suit is shown by the complete absence of complaint on the part of shippers or the public generally....	417
XXV. In its last analysis the relief here sought is experimental and not judicial in its nature. The Government does not seek the destruction of a new and unlawfully created condition which took the place of an old and natural one; it seeks the destruction of an old and natural condition in order that it may create by a new and untried experiment a condition which has no prototype.....	418
XXVI. Matters of subsidiary importance.....	419
(a) The price paid in 1899 by the Southern Pacific Company for Central Pacific shares was not excessive	419
(b) Neither the Northern Division of the Southern Pacific Railroad nor its Coast Line opened in 1901 bears upon the issues here involved..	420
(c) In considering the estoppels against the Government arising out of the settlement of 1899, it is of no consequence whether the provisions thereof which were designed to protect the Government were in the first instance suggested by Mr. Speyer or by the Government itself	422

Page

- (d) The powers of the Commission under the Act of July 7, 1898, were limited in those particulars only which are expressed in the act. In respect of matters not so limited the Commission had what the act gave it, "full power" in the matter..... 423

- (e) Because of the 30 years' de facto unification of the properties, this case is in a class apart.. 425

- (f) Testimony contained in Report of Pacific Railroad Commission is not competent evidence of facts therein narrated..... 426

XXVII. Conclusion 427

TABLE OF CASES

	Pages
Abbott v. N. Y. R. R. Co., 145 Mass. 450, 15 N. E. 91 (1888)	314
Atchison v. Peterson, 20 Wall. 507 (1874).....	317
Aurora City v. West, 7 Wall. 82 (1869).....	354
Austin's Jurisprudence.....	289
Bass v. Occidental Life Ins. Co., 19 N. M. 193, 142 Pac. 798 (1914)	307
Bear Lake Co. v. Garland, 164 U. S. 1 (1896).....	383
Beloit v. Morgan, 7 Wall. 619 (1869).....	354
Bigelow on Estoppel.....	341
Bradley v. Marshall, 54 Ill., 173 (1870).....	307
Broder v. Water Co., 101 U. S. 274 (1879).....	318
Buford v. Houtz, 133 U. S. 320 (1890).....	317
Caldwell v. Smith, 77 Ala. 157 (1884).....	343
California v. Central Pacific R. Co., 127 U. S. 1, (1888)....	22, 36
Canten Roll & Machine Co. v. Rolling Mill Co., 155 Fed. 321 (1907).....	341
Central Pacific R. R. Co. v. California, 162 U. S. 91 (1896)..	410
Chamberlain v. Dunlop, 126 N. Y. 45; 26 N. E. 966 (1891)..	389
Chicago R. R. v. R. R. Commission, 237 U. S. 220 (1915)....	365
Clearwater v. Meredith, 1 Wall 25 (1863).....	203
Coe v. Hobby, 72 N. Y. 141 (1878).....	389
Commonwealth v. Turnpike Co., 153 Pa. St. 47, 25 Atl. 1105 (1893)	311
Corporation of Canterbury v Cooper, 99 Law Times Rep. (N. S.) 612 (1908).....	390
Cromwell v. County of Sac., 94 U. S. 351 (1877).....	355
Curtis v. Trustees of Bardstown, 29 Ky. 538 (1831).....	352
Dahl v. Montana Copper Co., 132 U. S. 264 (1889).....	402
Daniels v. Tearney, 102 U. S. 415 (1880).....	343
Davis v. Wakelee, 156 U. S. 680 (1895).....	342
Del Bondio v. Insurance Co., 28 La. Ann. 139 (1876)....	344
Denton v. Erwin, 5 La. Ann. 18 (1850).....	344
Deseret Salt Co. v. Tarpey, 142 U. S. 241 (1891).....	314
Detroit Ry. v. Mich. Comm., 235 U. S. 402, (1914).....	358
Doe v. Courtenay, 11 Q. B. 702, 116 Eng. Rep. 636 (1848)..	389
Doe v. Poole, 11 Q. B. 714, 116 Eng. Rep. 641 (1848).....	388, 389
Easton v. Penny, 67 Law Times Rep. (N. S.) 290, 41 W. R. 72 (1892).....	390
Flagg v. Dow, 99 Mass. 18 (1868).....	388
Galt v. Provan, 131 Iowa 277, 108 N. W. 760 (1906).....	345
Gammon v. Freeman, 31 Maine 243 (1850).....	305
Grogan v. San Francisco, 18 Cal. 590 (1861).....	313

TABLE OF CASES

xiii

	Pages
Halsbury's Laws of England, 24 p. 264.....	289
Harley v. State, 40 Ala. 689 (1867).....	406
Henderson v. Henderson, 3 Hare 115.....	354
Herman, on Estoppel.....	341
Hodges v. Winston, 95 Ala. 514, 11 So. 200 (1892).....	347
Houck v. Frisbee, 66 Mo. App. 16 (1896).....	306, 307
Kerfoot v. Farmers & Merchants' Bank, 218 U. S. 281 (1910)	412
Lester Agricultural Chemical Works v. Selby, 68 N. J. Eq. 271, 59 Atl. 247 (1904).....	388
Logan v. Tibbott, 4 Green (Ia.) 389 (1854).....	307
MacDonald v. Wolff, 40 Mo. App. 302 (1890).....	305
MacFadden v. United States, 213 U. S. 288 (1909).....	202
McKee v. Chautauqua Assembly (C. C. A., 2nd Ct. 1904) 130 Fed. 536.....	405
Market Street Co. v. Hellman, 109 Cal. 571 (1895).....	405
Mattingly's Executor v. Brents, 155 Ky. 570, 159 S. W. 1157 (1913)	292
Metropolitan Securities Co. v. Ladd (C. C. A., 2nd Ct. 1909) 173 Fed. 269.....	304
Michels v. Olmstead, 157 U. S. 198 (1895).....	342
Michigan Land & Lumber Co. v. Rust (C. C. A., 6th Ct., 1895) 68 Fed. 155.....	315
Michigan v. Jackson R. Co. (C. C. A., 6th Ct., 1895) 69 Fed. 116.....	315
Milliken v. Faulk, 111 Ala. 658; 20 So. 594 (1896).....	292
Montgomery Traction Co. v. Montgomery Light & Water Power Co., (C. C. A., 5th Ct., 1916) 229 Fed. 672.....	407
Moser v. Phila. R. R. Co., 233 Pa. 259, 82 Atl. 362 (1912)..<	346
Noble v. Ward, L. R. 2 Ex. 135 (1867).....	390
Norfolk Railroad Co. v. Perdue, 40 W. Va. 442, 21 S. E. 755 (1895)	311
Nugent v. The Supervisors, 19 Wall. 241 (1873).....	203
Ogden v. Rowley, 15 Ind. 56 (1860).....	345
Oregon & C. R. Co. v. United States, 238 U. S. 393 (1915)..<	27
Page, on Contracts.....	305
Park's Estate, 29 Utah 257; 81 Pac 83 (1905).....	426
Railway Co. v. McCarthy, 96 U. S. 258 (1878).....	342
Realty and Rebuilding Company v. Rea (Sup. Ct. Cal., 1920) 194 Pac. 1024.....	292
Roberts v. Vonnegut, 58 Ind. App. 142, 104 N. E. 321 (1914)..<	307
Samuels v. Ottinger, 169 Cal. 209 (1915).....	292
Schenectady & Saratoga Plank Road Co. v. Thatcher, 11 N. Y. 102 (1854).....	405

	Pages
Schieffelin v. Carpenter, 15 Wend. 400 (1836).....	389
Shaw v. First Baptist Church, 44 Minn. 22; 46 N. W. 146 (1890)	307
Shaw v. Kellogg, 170 U. S. 312, (1898).....	316
Sinking Fund Cases, 99 U. S. 700 (1879).....	10
Siren, The, 7 Wall 152 (1869).....	311
Smith v. Kerr, 108 N. Y. 31; 15 N. E. 70 (1888).....	389
Southern Pacific Co. v. Interstate Commerce Commission, 200 U. S. 536 (1906).....	241
Southern Pacific Company's Ownership of Atlantic Steam- ship Lines, 43 I. C. C. 168 (1917).....	256, 328
Southern Pac. R. Co. v. Orton, 6 Sawy. 157; 32 Fed. 457 (1879)	32, 44
Southern Pac. R. Co. v. United States, 168 U. S. 1 (1897)...	34
Southern Pac. R. Co. v. United States, 189 U. S. 447, (1903)	40
State v. Flint Railroad Co., 89 Mich. 481, 51 N. W. 103 (1891)	316
State v. Illinois Central R. R. Co., 246 Ill. 188, 92 N. E. 814 (1910).....	310
State of Iowa v. Carr (C. C. A., 8th Ct., 1911), 191 Fed. 257	309, 348
State v. Hallock, 20 Nev. 73, 15 Pac. 472 (1887).....	315
State v. New Orleans, 104 La. 685, 29 So. 312 (1900).....	316
Stearns v. Wood, 236 U. S. 75, (1915).....	202
Stetson v. Stetson, 146 N. Y. S. 245 (1914).....	426
Stockton v. Ford, 18 How. 418 (1855).....	353
Stone v. United States, 64 Fed. 667 (1894).....	358
Thomas v. Zumbalen, 43 Mo. 471 (1869).....	388
Tiffany on Real Property.....	292
Town of Weston v. Ralston, 48, W. Va. 170, 36 S. E. 446 (1900)	342
Turner Construction Co. v. Union Terminal Co., (C. C. A. 5th Ct., 1916) 229 Fed. 702.....	408
Union National Bank v. Matthews, 98 U. S. 621 (1879)....	412
Union Pacific R. Co. v. Hall, 91 U. S. 343 (1876).....	14
Union Pacific R. Co. v. United States (1877) 13 Ct. Claims, 401; s. c., (1878) 99 U. S. 402.....	19
United States v. California & Oregon Land Company, 192 U. S. 355 (1904).....	356
United States v. Clark (C. C. A. 9th Ct., 1905) 138 Federal 294	310
United States v. Central Pacific R. Co., (1877) 4 Sawy. 341; 25 Fed. Cas. 354; s. c., (1878) 99 U. S. 449.....	19
United States v. Debs, 64 Fed. 724 (1894).....	270
United States v. Detroit Timber & Lumber Co. (C. C. A. 8th Ct., 1904), 131 Fed. 668.....	309
United States v. Flint, Fed. Cas. No. 15, 121 (1876).....	311

TABLE OF CASES

xv

	Pages
United States v. Great Lakes Towing Co., 208 Fed. 733, (1913)	373
United States v. New England Fish Exchange, 258 Fed. 732 (1919)	374
United States v. Northern Pacific Ry. Co., 177 U. S. 435 (1900)	375
United States v. Reading Co., 183 Fed. 427 (1910).....	376
United States v. Southern Pac. R. Co., 146 U. S. 570 (1892)...	377
United States v. S. P. Co., C. P. R. Co., et al. 239 Fed. 998 (1917)	378, 380, 384, 386, 393, 395, 417, 421, 423.
United States v. Stinson (C. C. A. 7th Ct., 1903) 125 Fed. 907	347
U. S. v. Trans-Missouri, 166 U. S. 290 (1897).....	382
United States v. Union Pacific R. Co., 188 Fed. 102 (1911).....	244
United States v. Union Pacific R. Co., 226 U. S. 61, (1912).....	122, 192, 205, 206, 219, 220, 285, 318, 337, 349, 411
United States v. Union Pacific R. Co., 148 U. S. 562 (1893)...	16
United States v. United States Steel Corp. 251 U. S. 417 (1920)	286, 302, 308, 373, 376, 417, 419
United States v. White, 17 Fed. 561 (1883).....	311
United States v. Willamette Co., 54 Fed. 807 (1892).....	309
United States v. Yorba, 1 Wall. 412 (1864).....	9
Van Rensselaer's Heirs v. Penniman, 6 Wend. 569 (1831)...	388
Venner v. New York Central & H. R. R. Co., 177 App. Div. 296, 164 N. Y. S. 626 (1917).....	293, 382
Walker v. United States, 139 Fed. 409 (1905).....	348
Walker v. Walker, 37 La. Ann. 107 (1885).....	344
Waskey v. Chambers, 224 U. S. 564 (1912).....	291
Waterpark v. Fennell, 7 H. C. L. 684, 11 Eng. Rep. 273...	397
Western Adv. Co. v. Star Publishing Co., 146 Mo. App. 90, 123 S. W. 969 (1910).....	307
Wiggins Ferry Co. v. O. & M. Ry., 142 U. S. 396 (1892)...	355
Witmark v. New York Elevated Railroad Co., 76 Hun. 302 (1894)	389
Woodfall on Landlord and Tenant.....	389
Ziek v. London United Tramways, Ltd., L. R. 2 K. B. 126 (1908)	390